

60,246-225
10,129

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application: Randall, et al.

Serial No.: 10/631,193

Filed: 07/31/2003

Group Art Unit: 3637

Examiner: Mai, Lanna

For: SNAP-IN PANEL DESIGN FOR A REFRIGERATION COOLER

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

SEP 20 2007

REPLY TO EXAMINER'S ANSWER

Mail Stop AF
Commissioner for Patents
P. O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

Applicant hereby addresses each of the arguments raised by the Examiner.

With respect to the rejection of *Montes* in view of *DeWitt*, the Examiner fails to address Applicant's argument that *DeWitt* teaches away from *Montes*. Moreover, the contention that one of ordinary skill in the art would employ multiple protruding connecting members on the same panel fails to support the contention that both of these connecting members be snap-fit connectors. Accordingly, the rejection is improper.

With respect to the art rejection of *DeWitt* in view of *Montes*, the Examiner makes two inconsistent assumptions: first, the Examiner contends that the snap fit connector of *Montes* is functionally equivalent to the connector of *DeWitt*; and second, snap-fit connectors would provide a more secure attachment. It does not make sense for the connectors to be both functionally equivalent and one type of connector be better than the

60,246-225
10,129

other. Putting aside this inconsistency, there is no support for either position set forth in the references. There is simply no reason to substitute the type of connection taught by *DeWitt* for the snap-fit connection of *Montes*.

With respect to the rejection of *Montes* in view of *Edgar*, even assuming all the limitations are taught by the combined references, there is no motivation to modify *Montes* with *Edgar*. Indeed, there is no reason to make two snap-fit connectors of *Montes* operate in two different directions. Indeed, one panel may be constructed to have one snap-fit connector in one direction and a different type of connector operate in another direction. There is no motivation in either reference to make both connections snap-fit in two different directions.

For the reasons stated in its Appeal Brief and in this Reply, Applicant requests the final rejections of claims 1, 9, 10, 13-20 and 22 be withdrawn.

Respectfully submitted,

CARLSON, GASKEY & OLDS

By: 

Anthony P. Cho, Reg. No. 47,209
400 W. Maple Rd., Ste. 350
Birmingham, MI 48009
(248) 988-8360

Dated: September 20, 2007

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE

I hereby certify that this Reply to Examiner's Answer relative to Application Serial No. 10/631,193 is being facsimile transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office (Fax No. (571) 273-8300) on September 20, 2007.


Theresa M. Palmateer

N:\Clients\CARRIER\IP00225\PATENT\Reply to Examiner's Answer 9-20-07.doc